DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 424 684 EA 029 463

AUTHOR Ulriksen, Janice J.
TITLE Perceptions of Secondary School Teachers and Principals Concerning Factors Related to Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction.
PUB DATE 1996-00-00
NOTE 100p.; Ed.D Dissertation, University of Southern California.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Burnout; *Job Satisfaction; *Principals; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Morale; *Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Commitment

ABSTRACT

An analysis of teachers' job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction is presented in this paper. The report focuses on the perceptions of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction held by both male and female Caucasian teachers in grades 7-12. The teachers' perceptions were then compared to the perceptions of principals. The sample included 64 teachers, which represented 4 teachers from 9 intermediate and 7 high schools in the Garden Grove Unified School District near Los Angeles, California. The study utilized both qualitative and quantitative research strategies, which included telephone interviews and questionnaires. The findings indicate that teachers viewed the work itself, achievement, responsibility, recognition, and possibility of growth as factors that contributed to their feeling good during a satisfying job experience. They derived the most job satisfaction from recognition, achievement, and the work itself. Intrinsic factors contributed more to job satisfaction than they did to job dissatisfaction. Principals accurately perceived that recognition, achievement, and the work itself contributed to the teachers' feelings of job satisfaction and misperceived that the principal's behavior had a positive effect on teachers' job satisfaction. (Contains 64 references and 3 appendices containing teacher and principal questionnaires.) (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 424 684

PERCEPTIONS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS CONCERNING FACTORS RELATED TO JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB DISSATISFACTION

by

Janice J. Ulriksen, Ed. D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Ulriksen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 029 463

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Page

I. THE PROBLEM 1

Introduction
The Problem Situation
Purpose
Importance of the Study
Research Questions
Conceptual Assumptions
Methodological Assumptions
Delimitations
Limitations
Definition of Terms
Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation

II. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE 12

Reasons That Individuals Enter the Teaching Profession
The Attrition of Teachers
Definition of Job Satisfaction
Motivation and the Nature of Man
The Human Relations Movement
Maslow's Theory of Motivation
McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y
Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory
Research Concerning Job Satisfaction and Motivation of Teachers
Effective Schools Research and the Role of the Principal
Summary

III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES 32

Introduction
Design
Selection of Subjects
Data Collection

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES (Continued)

Instrumentation
Data Analysis

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 40

Analysis of Findings
Discussion

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 70

Summary
Conclusions
Recommendations

REFERENCES 79

APPENDIXES:

A: POSITIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS. 84
B. NEGATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS 87
C: POSITIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS 90
D: NEGATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS 93

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

1. The Mean Score for Level of Acceptance Indicated by Teachers of Factors Considered Contributing to Their Feeling Good During the Satisfying Job Incident Described During the Critical Incident Interview (N = 64) 42

2. The Mean Score for Level of Acceptance Reflecting Perceptions Held by Principals of Factors Contributing to Teachers' Feeling Good During a Satisfying Job Incident (N = 16) 43

3. The Mean Score for Level of Acceptance Indicated by Teachers of Factors Considered Contributing to Their Feeling Bad During the Dissatisfying Job Incident Described During the Critical Incident Interview (N = 64) 44

4. The Mean Score for Level of Acceptance Reflecting Perceptions Held by Principals of Factors that Contributed to Teachers Feeling Bad During a Dissatisfying Job Incident (N = 16) . . .46

5. Difference Between the Mean Level Score of Acceptance by Teachers of Factors Considered Contributing to Their Feeling Good During the Positive Incident (Feeling Good) Described During the Critical Incident Interview, and the Mean Level Score of the Principals' Perceptions 52

6. Difference Between the Mean Level Score of Acceptance by Teachers of Factors Considered Contributing to Their Feeling Bad During the Negative Incident (Feeling Bad) Described During the Critical Incident Interview, and the Mean Level Score of the Principals' Perceptions 53

7. Frequency and Percentages of Factors Represented by the Description of the Satisfying Job Incident During the Critical Incident Interview (N = 64) 54

8. Frequency and Percentages of Factors Represented by the Description of the Dissatisfying Job Incident During the Critical Incident Interview (N = 64) 56

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Since the early 1980s, the United States has become increasingly aware of the range of critical issues facing its schools. The issues, which have become nationwide, have included not only problems of declining academic performance and growing apathy of students toward the value of education, but also concerns about the attrition, availability, and qualifications of public school teachers.

Teachers with the greatest ability and potential have quit teaching in greater numbers than their less able counterparts (Hart & Murphy, 1990). The most promising teachers left the profession expressing a lack of confidence that the school would consistently reward good teachers (Hart, 1992). The survey results of nearly 2,000 public school teachers in 1984 showed that 53% of the respondents would not advise a young person to pursue a career in education. Fifty-two percent indicated that they did not feel respected by society, and nearly 20% were not satisfied with their job as a public school teacher (Metropolitan Life, 1985).

These critical issues facing the United States have serious implications not only for the successful and effective operation of public schools, but also for the future of the American workforce, United States economic competitiveness, and, ultimately, the condition of the American society itself (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1993).

The Problem Situation

Sadly, the intrinsic aspects of teaching appear to have deteriorated over the past twenty years. Teachers have become devalued by the community, the public, and themselves. The percentage of the American population who would be pleased to have one of their children become a teacher fell from 75% in 1969 to 45% in 1983 (Gallop, 1984). Of teachers who seriously considered leaving teaching, 25% cited a lack of respect as a reason (Metropolitan Life, 1985). Furthermore, when teachers were asked to rank 12 occupations (including teacher, physician, clergy, principal, judge, funeral director, politician, banker, and advertiser) in terms of contribution to the good of society and societal prestige, they ranked themselves first in contribution and last in prestige (Elam, 1989).

The teacher, however, has remained the key element in the success of the educational organization (Fullen & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Therefore, it is critical that teachers remain motivated and committed to their profession in order for the school and its students to be successful. Principals need to be aware of those factors that provide job satisfaction to teachers so that they may provide an environment that encourages teachers to put forth their best effort.

Educational leaders are challenged to provide the appropriate motivation that will foster teachers to seek continually to grow and to better themselves and their teaching. Likert (1977) found that motivation was likely to improve and/or to remain high if an organization was associated with leadership processes based upon teamwork,

understanding, trust, and participation in decision making. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) studied the perceptions of the ideal principal. They concluded that teachers saw the ideal principal as being both orientated toward the system and the teachers. Current research indicated that effective educational leaders prioritized meeting the needs and achievement goals of both the school and the faculty (Drake & Roe, 1986).

However, research in business (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988) and in education (Beffert, 1992) indicated that there was a discrepancy between what managers perceived motivated their employees and what really motivated their employees. Hersey and Blanchard (1988) concluded that managers acted on the basis of their perceptions, not on reality. By bringing their perceptions closer to reality or to the needs and desires of employees, managers could increase their effectiveness by increasing employee job satisfaction that would ultimately result in greater employee motivation.

Purpose

Within the conceptual framework of Herzberg (Herzberg, Mausner, & Synderman, 1959), the purposes of this dissertation were to (a) determine factors associated with the perceptions of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction held by both male and female Caucasian teachers in grades 7-12 and (b) compare the perceptions of teachers about those factors to the perceptions indicated by principals as contributing to teacher job satisfaction and teacher job dissatisfaction.

Importance of the Study

Reviews of teacher dissatisfaction presented by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) and the Holmes Group (1986) have reinforced the need to strengthen teachers and teaching as a profession.

As a result, once qualified teachers are selected and placed at a school, it is important not only to provide an atmosphere in which they will continue to grow professionally but also that fosters their commitment to the teaching profession. Therefore, it becomes the responsibility of the school administration to be able to identify those factors that motivate teachers and meet the needs that encourage professionalism, commitment, and growth.

This study was considered important, as it sought to identify those factors that motivated teachers in grades 7-12 and to compare those results to the perceptions held by principals concerning the factors that they perceived would cause teachers to be motivated. This study could serve as a possible resource to principals as they continue to increase the effectiveness of their schools by increasing the job satisfaction of their personnel. The increased job satisfaction would ultimately result in increased personnel motivation and retention of qualified teachers.

Research Questions

In the research questions to follow, the perceptions of teachers concerning factors of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were considered as were the perceptions of administrators regarding teachers' level of job satisfaction or job

dissatisfaction on the same factors. These factors were based on the constructs of the Herzberg motivation-hygiene theory (Herzberg et al. 1959). The factors according to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, with 1 to 6 considered motivational and 7 to 16 considered hygiene, were as follows:

1. Achievement
2. Advancement
3. Possibility of growth
4. Recognition for achievement
5. Responsibility
6. Work itself
7. Interpersonal relations with peers
8. Interpersonal relations with subordinates
9. Interpersonal relations with superiors
10. Job security
11. Personal life
12. Policy and administration
13. Salary
14. Status
15. Supervision
16. Working conditions.

Based upon a sample of 64 teachers, of whom 16 were from each of four subject matter areas of English/language arts, history/social studies, mathematics, and science, and a population of 16 principals (7 from high school and 9 from intermediate school) from the Garden Grove Unified School District (GGUSD), a suburban school district adjacent to Los Angeles, the following six research questions (the first five corresponding to the questionnaire information and the sixth one corresponding to the interview data) were posed:

1. For the six motivating factors in the Herzberg motivation-hygiene theory (achievement, advancement, possibility of growth, recognition for achievement, responsibility, work itself), what was the level of acceptance expressed by teachers for themselves and the level of acceptance by teachers as indicated by administrators on each of several item statements in a four-step Likert type format that were perceived as contributing to teachers' (a) feeling good or (b) feeling bad about the job of teaching at the levels of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree (by the total sample of teachers and the total sample of principals)?

2. For the 10 hygiene factors in the Herzberg motivation-hygiene theory (interpersonal relations with peers, interpersonal relations with subordinates, interpersonal relations with superiors, job security, personal life, policy and administration, salary, status, supervision, working conditions), what was the level of acceptance expressed by teachers by themselves and the level of acceptance by teachers as indicated by administrators on each of several item statements in a four-step

Likert-type format that were perceived as contributing to teachers' (a) feeling good or (b) feeling bad about the job of teaching at the levels of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree (by the total sample of teachers and the total sample of principals)?

3. What differences, if any, occurred in the responses to item statements of the total group of administrators and total group of teachers with respect to the six motivating factors enumerated in the first research question and the 10 hygiene factors cited in the second research question in the same context of being perceived as contributing to good or bad feelings?

4. With respect to the first two research questions, what differences were noted among subgroups of teachers differentiated by (a) assignment to intermediate school or to high school, (b) age, (c) gender, (d) number of years of professional experience, and (e) subject matter area of teacher?

5. To the extent possible, what differences, if any, in the patterns of perceptions were noted between teachers and principals?

6. In terms of information obtained from critical incidents cited by teachers from interviews directed toward identification of a satisfying job experience and a dissatisfying job experience, what similarities or differences could be identified from the total sample of teachers?

Conceptual Assumptions

The following conceptual assumptions were central to this investigation:

1. The theoretical framework posed by Frederick Herzberg's (Herzberg et al., 1959) motivation-hygiene model provided the constructs central to the research questions of this study.

2. Maslow's (1954) theoretical framework of self-actualization afforded a secondary conceptualization within which some of the findings would be interpreted and interrelated.

3. All respondents had reached a level of cognitive maturity that would allow them to understand the directions and the content of the questions asked of them.

Methodological Assumptions

The following methodological assumptions were made:

1. All respondents answered the questions candidly and honestly.

2. The design and data processing procedures selected for this study were appropriate to the intent of the investigation.

3. The data collecting and data recording procedures were accurately performed.

4. The coders of the study exhibited a sufficient level of interrater agreement so that satisfactory reliability of responses was realized.

5. The interview questions and questionnaire items represented a relatively accurate operationalization or translation of the constructs in Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory so that they were interpreted in a meaningful way.

Delimitations

The following delimitations were evident in this study:

1. The study sample was restricted to only Caucasian teachers who taught English/language arts, history/social studies, mathematics, and science in the GGUSD.

2. Only teachers who provided instruction in intermediate or high school were selected for this study.

3. The study sample include only intermediate and high school principals in the GGUSD.

Limitations

The limitations after completion of the inquiry were as follows:

1. When categorizing incidents, the coders might have demonstrated a degree of bias.

2. The size of the sample was less than desired.

3. The critical incident technique itself might involve limitations in that the technique relies upon a consistent interpretation of the meaning of each question by each subject.

4. The findings probably were not generalizable beyond the district in which the study was conducted.

5. The internal and external validities must be limited to the extent that the assumptions were not met.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following terms have been defined:

Critical Incident Technique

A questioning strategy developed to determine job attitudes in which respondents related specific significant events or incidents that caused them either to feel good about their job or to feel bad about their job.

Intermediate School

The intermediate schools in this study housed grades 7 and 8.

High School

The high schools in this study housed grades 9-12.

Motivation

Motivation is a concept that cannot be directly observed. According to Berelson and Steiner (1964), motivation was defined as an inner state that energizes, activates or moves, and directs or channels behavior toward goals.

Motivation-Hygiene Theory

A two-factor theory developed by Frederick Herzberg. The motivation factors affected feelings of job satisfaction and the hygiene factors affected feelings of job dissatisfaction.

Principal

The principal was the chief administrator of the school.

Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation

Chapter II presents a review of literature on job satisfaction as it relates to employee motivation. It includes research on reasons why teachers leave the profession, descriptions of relevant motivation theories, and research concerning job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. Chapter III focuses on the methodology used in the study. It describes the procedures used to gather and to organize the data obtained through the use of questionnaires and interviews. Chapter IV affords an analysis and evaluation of the data that were collected for this study. Chapter V provides a summary of this inquiry along with conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of the literature on job satisfaction and the job satisfaction especially of teachers that is particularly relevant to this study. This chapter is organized within the ten main divisions with the following headings: (a) Reasons That Individuals Enter the Teaching Profession, (b) The Attrition of Teachers, (c) Definition of Job Satisfaction, (d) Motivation and the Nature of Man, (e) The Human Relations Movement, (f) Maslow's Theory of Motivation (Maslow, 1954), (g) McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y (McGregor, 1960), (h) Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory (Herzberg, 1966, 1968; Herzberg et al., 1959), (i) Research Concerning Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction of Teachers, and (j) Effective Schools Research and the Role of the Principal.

Reasons That Individuals Enter the Teaching Profession

A 45-year-old high school teacher was quoted in DeLong (1987):

> There isn't a day that goes by that somebody doesn't ask me why I chose teaching as a career. I am simply convinced that my interest in children and their well-being played a larger role in my decision making than anything else. I know I can make the world better due to my efforts.
> (p. 119)

From at least the nineteenth century, the comparatively low salaries of teaching and modest socioeconomic prestige have contributed to an occupational culture that has placed less emphasis on extrinsic rewards than on the satisfaction derived from

working with young people. Over the last decades, service-related aims and intrinsic rewards were consistently cited by education students as among the most important reasons for their decision to teach (Andrew, 1983; DeLong, 1987; Jantzen, 1981; Joseph & Green, 1986; Willcox & Beigel, 1953; Zimpher, 1989).

The Attrition of Teachers

Research concerning the attrition of teachers over the last decades has shown a fairly consistent rate. Research during the 1970s (Charters, 1970; Mark & Anderson, 1978) demonstrated that one out of every four teachers eventually changed to another career. A survey conducted by the National Education Association (National Education Association, 1980) revealed that 25% of the 1,738 teacher respondents expressed dissatisfaction with their current jobs, one in 10 said that he or she would leave teaching as soon as possible, and two in 10 said that they were undecided as to how long they would remain teachers.

A longitudinal study of full-time Indiana public school teachers was conducted between 1965 and 1987 (Kirby & Grissmer, 1993). The information gathered involved over 50,000 teachers during this time period. The data revealed that approximately 20% of new teachers left after one year of teaching. Another 13% left by the end of the second year, and by the end of the fourth year, a little over half of each new teacher cohort had left teaching.

In Michigan, between 1972 and 1978, 21% of new teachers had terminated their employment by the end of the first year and 13% of those who remained had left

after the end of the second year. During this same time, in North Carolina, 11% of new teachers had resigned after one year and 8% of those remaining had left after two years. Following this initial two-year period, the risk of leaving declined over time to about 5% for mid-career teachers (Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple, & Olsen, 1991).

A similar study involving attrition patterns of Pennsylvania teachers was conducted between 1989 and 1991 (Pessima, 1993). The attrition rate for teachers after one year of teaching was 18.3% and averaged 5% for mid-career teachers. The National Center for Educational Statistics Schools and Staffing Survey also showed a 5% attrition rate among mid-career teachers between 1978 and 1988 (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1993).

The National Center for Educational Statistics (1994) determined the percentage of teachers who would be willing to choose teaching as a career if they could chose over again. The statistics were given in 5-year intervals beginning with 1961. In 1961, 77% of teachers would certainly or probably would choose teaching as a career if they could choose again. The percentages remained fairly consistent until 1981 when there was a substantial drop to 46% of teachers who maintained that they certainly would or probably would chose teaching again as a career. The percentages remained low until 1991 when the percentage increased to 59% as a possible result of the reform efforts initiated during the mid-1980s. This 1991 percentage was correlated with the results of a similar survey of Outstanding Vermont Teachers conducted in 1992 (Heussler, 1993). Additional results involving 339 North Carolina K-12 teachers

showed that 58% of the teachers was very satisfied or satisfied with teaching, whereas the remaining 42% was dissatisfied or very dissatisfied (Heller, Clay, & Perkins, 1992).

In addition to the teacher attrition problem in this country, those teachers with the greatest ability and potential have quit in greater numbers than have their less able counterparts. A retention study showed that only 37% of teachers in the top 10% of measured verbal ability on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (Educational Testing Service, 1948-1996) remained in teaching, whereas more than 60% of those in the lowest 10% continued as teachers. Furthermore, turnover has been higher among teachers in the areas of science and mathematics remain because there were more opportunities to leave teaching for higher paying jobs in those content areas (Hart & Murphy, 1990). The longitudinal study of Indiana teachers revealed that, by the end of the fifth year, 70% of new chemistry and/or physics instructors had left teaching (Kirby & Grissmer, 1993).

To investigate why teachers chose to leave teaching, Hall, Pearson and Carroll (1992) surveyed a random sample, stratified by school, of nearly 6,500 teachers in a large urban school district in Florida. Twenty-two percent of the teachers indicated that they were going to quit teaching. Those who planned to leave teaching placed emphasis on insufficient rewards and recognition, limited opportunity for advancement, and stressful working conditions. Chapman and Hutcheson had previously performed, in 1982, a similar investigation. They concluded that teachers who left the teaching

profession were dissatisfied with salary, responsibility, recognition, and the possibility for growth.

Hart (1992) reviewed research conducted in Utah, Colorado, and Missouri during 1985-1991. The research was concerned with the effects of work reform on teacher turnover. Teachers were rated by their principals as outstanding, good, average, or low in promise. Principal ratings along with the teacher's undergraduate grade point averages were used to categorize the teachers into two groups, outstanding promise and less promising. The most promising teachers who had left teaching expressed a lack of confidence that the schools would consistently reward good teachers with responsibility, advancement opportunities, and salary.

When Sweeny (1981) compared the results of a high school teacher needs survey to the findings from an identical survey given in 1968, he found that needs rose in the categories of esteem and self-actualization. Sweeny concluded that teachers perceived themselves less worthy and productive than they had a decade earlier.

Definition of Job Satisfaction

Historically, because of the influence of behaviorists on the field of psychology, little research had been done concerning job satisfaction. Psychologists avoided doing research that depended upon introspective self-reports because the behaviorists strongly stated that if psychology were to develop as a science, it had to study observable behavior. Because satisfaction was an internal subjective state that was best reported by the people experiencing it, satisfaction was not seen as a proper subject for

study. Thus, because of the lack of a theory stating causal relationships, the research on job satisfaction consistently looked simply for relationships among variables (Coon, 1980).

Consequently, one of the difficulties in assessing teacher job satisfaction was the problem of definition. Although there was considerable confusion in the literature as to the scope and nature of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, there was general agreement that they referred to the teacher's composite attitude or emotional response toward a job (Lawler, 1973). According to Locke (1976), because satisfaction was an emotional response, the meaning of the concept could only be discovered and grasped by a process of introspection that depended upon an individual's mental contents and processes. Locke defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the self-appraisal of one's job or job experiences. Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives that it is offering. Other researchers, as had Lortie (1975), used behavioristic terms such as the willingness of teachers to choose teaching as a career if they had to begin over again.

The most common approach to understanding job satisfaction was to apply the principles of motivation theories. Zimbardo (1979) defined motivation to be the source of energy within an organism assumed to affect its tendency toward action. Motivation arose either from states of deprivation that made reinforcers effective, or from one's values and beliefs. The motive as described by Murray (1964) was composed of two

parts. The first part, drive, was the internal process which prodded a person into action. The second portion of a motive was the reward or goal attainment which terminated the drive. It was the reward or goal attainment that generated satisfaction. When satisfaction occurred, the original motive no longer directed the behavior.

Both components of motive, drive and reward, occurred internally. Campbell and Pritchard (1976) used the definition, performance = f(ability X motivation), where performance could be regarded as almost any behavior directed toward task or goal accomplishment. In other words, motivation was a powerful ingredient in performance; ability, without motivation, was of little use. Gellerman (1968) maintained that motivation might be an influencing factor that could affect decisions individuals made. Such decisions could be expected to occur frequently in the matter of job persistence or job termination in relation to level of job satisfaction being experienced.

Motivation and the Nature of Man

For hundreds of years, psychologists and philosophers studying motivation attempted to explain why some goals or needs were desired by people while others were not. Discovering the essence of motivation has not been an easy task because motivation has been an academic concept that could not be directly observed. The work on motivation had been dominated by two different views concerning the nature of man. One view, having its origin in the writings of Freud and the neo-Freudians, described man as being driven by inherited, conflicting unconscious drives that caused

him to behave in instinctual ways. This view called for a work situation dominated by controls used by the organization to monitor and to direct the behavior of the worker. The other view, traced to the works of Plato and Aristotle, saw an individual as rational and aware of his goals accompanied by behaving in ways that he or she perceived would help him achieve his or her goals. This view suggested that motivation might be influenced by the use of setting goals and that self-control was possible (Coon, 1980).

Over this century, the views of man's nature have been reflected in the structure of organizations, in management's attitudes toward employees, and in factors identified with job satisfaction. As a result of the industrial revolution, a new form of organization was needed to resolve problems resulting from many employees working together in production facilities. According to Locke (1976), Frederick Taylor developed the concept of scientific management as a result of studying the behavior of workers in an effort to eliminate wasted time, effort, and ultimately money. It was thought that the application of bureaucratic structure and organizational control would promote rational, efficient, and disciplined behavior and would result in high productivity. The factors identified with job satisfaction were the physical arrangements of the work, physical working conditions, and pay. Taylor assumed that a worker who accepted the scientific management philosophy and who received the highest possible earnings with the least amount of fatigue, would be satisfied and productive (Locke, 1976).

The Human Relations Movement

In a continued effort to improve productivity, during the 1930s, the Hawthorne Studies by Elton Mayo, as reported by Locke (1976), initially began as a study of the effects of rest pauses, fatigue, incentives, and other factors upon output. They found, however, that workers had thinking minds and that their opinions concerning the work condition affected their reactions to it. The interpretations of the Hawthorne Studies stressed both the role of the informal work group and supervisory practices in shaping employee attitudes, satisfaction, and ultimately performance.

The outgrowth of the Hawthorne studies along with the social climate of the country following World War II, stimulated the beginning of the human relations movement. This movement stressed the central importance of both the supervisor and the work group in determining job satisfaction and productivity. The human relations methodology stressed practicing democratic principles of management and the resolution of problems in a cooperative manner, encouraged employee participation in structuring the work environment, and promoted open communication. The image of the employee was transformed from that of an extension of his machine, under the scientific management ideology, to that of a human being who had thoughts, feelings, and possible solutions to work problems. The social or human relations school emphasized the role of constructive supervision, cohesive work groups, and friendly employee-management relations in determining job satisfaction (Locke, 1976).

As the human relations movement began to develop, a new psychological perspective began to emerge from people who worked in the psychological field with human subjects. This humanistic movement attempted to emphasize the importance of how people perceived their world and the processes of health and growth. In their view, psychological events took place within environments that were in dynamic equilibrium. Such mental events represent a balance and interaction of many forces, and a change anywhere in the system was seen as affecting the whole system. Behavior was viewed as shaped not by individual chains of cause and effect, but by the combination of forces making up the system. They took the position that individuals were not solely the products of their environment, as behaviorists indicated, or controlled by unconscious forces as Freudians had written, but were internally directed by having free choice, being motivated by the desire to self-actualize, or by fulfilling their unique potential as human beings (Zimbardo, 1979).

Maslow's Theory of Motivation

Abraham Maslow (1954), one of the leading proponents of humanistic psychology, doubted the meaningfulness of applying the outcomes of animal experimentation to human beings and also questioned the image of human beings that the psychological theories of the time had produced. His clinical experience led him to decide that human life would never be understood unless its highest aspirations were taken into account. He indicated that growth, self-actualization, striving toward health,

a quest for identity, and the yearning for excellence must be accepted as universal human tendencies.

Maslow argued that human motivation can be broken down into five basic categories of needs. Listed in ascending order, they are (a) physiological needs (food, air, water, sex, shelter, and sleep); (b) safety needs (protection of job security as well as protection from danger, illness, economic disaster, and the unexpected); (c) love and belonging (the desire for affection, friendship and approval of others); (d) esteem needs, (i) self-esteem (the desire for achievement, mastery, competence, independence, and freedom) and (ii) esteem of others (prestige, reputation, and dominance); and (e) self-actualization (the desire to fulfill all of one's individual potentialities). Maslow distinguished the first two needs, physiological and safety, from those remaining by identifying them as deficiency needs. He labeled the remaining four as growth needs. Generally, gratification of deficiency needs depended upon other people, whereas gratification of growth needs depended more upon one's self. A relative degree of satisfaction of a lower need was necessary for the emergence of a higher need. Maslow indicated that most people were simultaneously partially satisfied and dissatisfied in all of their needs, with their higher needs being the least satisfied. The less satisfied a need, the more power it had to motivate (Maslow, 1954).

McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y

McGregor (1960) applied Maslow's (1954) basic needs theory to organizational management by developing his Theory X and Theory Y. He maintained that managers

had a choice between two approaches to motivation, each with different relationships among rewards, punishments, and perceived human needs. The first approach, called Theory X, characterized the average employee as being lazy, following rather than leading, as resisting change, and as being indifferent to organizational needs. He proposed that managers who followed Theory X used extrinsic rewards or punishments which were concerned with the environment of work. Within this classification of rewards were money, fringe benefits, coercion, threats, criticism, and pressure.

McGregor's response to Theory X was Theory Y. In this approach, he considered that people were dynamic human beings who were naturally self-activated. If given an opportunity, they would pursue work goals associated with the higher level intrinsic needs for autonomy, self-respect, responsibility, and achievement. McGregor stated that it was management's responsibility to design a work environment that permitted an individual to exploit his or her full range of motivations and, as a result, be of greater value to the organization as well as to himself or herself (McGregor, 1960).

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory

One of the most extensively researched approaches to intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation and job satisfaction has been that of Frederick Herzberg (Herzberg et al., 1959). He presented the results of his research concerning job attitudes and motivation known as the motivation-hygiene theory or two-factor theory of motivation. Semi-structured interviews using the critical incident technique were conducted with over 200 engineers and accountants in which participants were asked to describe events

related to a time when they felt exceptionally good about their job and a time when they felt exceptionally bad about their job. They were also asked the clarifying questions, "Can you tell me more precisely why you felt the way you did?" and "What did these events mean to you?"

A content analysis of the responses led to a fundamental distinction between the two sets of factors. One set of factors, the intrinsic factors, involved the actual doing of the job and the job content. The other set of factors involved the environment of the job, including the setting, context, and other extrinsic aspects of the job. The intrinsic factors that emerged from the analysis were achievement, advancement, possibility of growth,recognition,responsibility, and the work itself. Herzberg maintained that these factors led to satisfying job attitudes because they fulfill the individual's need for self-actualization. He labeled these satisfying factors as motivators.

The second set of factors had to do with the conditions that surrounded doing the job. Herzberg labeled these conditions hygiene factors because they acted in a manner similar to the principles of medical hygiene in that medical health hazards are removed from the environment in an attempt to prevent disease. According to Herzberg, improvement in the hygiene factors would remove impediments to positive job attitudes. These factors included company policy, interpersonal relations with either superiors, peers or subordinates, job security, personal life, salary, status, supervision, and working conditions (Herzberg et al., 1959).

Herzberg maintained that two separate and distinct sets of factors accounted for job satisfaction (motivation) and dissatisfaction (hygiene). The factors which were considered intrinsic served as motivators or satisfiers that were tied to the work content. The dissatisfiers, or hygiene factors, which were extrinsic to the work content, were concerned with the worker's environment. According to Herzberg, the hygiene factors failed to provide satisfaction because they did not possess the characteristics necessary for giving an individual a sense of growth. To feel that one had grown depended on achievement in tasks that had meaning to the individual. Because hygiene factors did not involve the tasks, they were unable to provide such meaning to the individual, as growth was dependent on some achievement. Achievement required a task. The motivators were task factors that could provide the psychological stimulation allowing an individual to meet his or her self-actualization needs.

Herzberg theorized that if the employees were operating from a neutral point the motivators would increase satisfaction beyond that neutral point. The absence of motivators would drop them to that neutral level, but would not turn them into dissatisfied employees. On the other hand, existence of the hygiene factors led to unhappy employees. Removing the hygiene factors would return the employee to the neutral point only. Removing the hygiene factors would not go beyond the neutral point to motivate. In other words, the motivation factors and hygiene factors did not form a hierarchy. Moreover, they were not at opposite ends of a continuum. They

were two separate and distinct dimensions. The opposite of job satisfaction was no job satisfaction. Similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction was no job dissatisfaction.

The implication for any work environment was that employees could not be motivated toward higher levels of productivity by improving hygiene factors alone such as increased salary, better working conditions, and more lenient or less restrictive policies. Manipulating the hygiene factors could only make educators move from dissatisfied to neutral. Only through the manipulation of motivators could improvement from neutral to satisfied be achieved (Herzberg, 1966, 1968).

In the few years that followed the publication of Herzberg's (Herzberg et al., 1959) original study of job satisfaction, 10 additional studies involving 17 populations and nearly 1,300 participants were conducted. The populations included accountants, lower level supervisors in the utility industry, Finnish supervisors, women in high level professional positions, county agriculture extension workers, pre-retirees from managerial positions, scientists, engineers (in three separate studies), manufacturing supervisors, male hourly technicians, female assemblers, hospital nurses, skilled hospital employees, unskilled hospital employees, and housekeeping workers. The results showed that the two hygiene factors, company policy and administration and supervision, appeared 16 and 13 times, respectively, out of the 17 responses. The remaining hygiene factors appeared with less frequency, and salary occurred only once. With respect to the motivating factors, achievement, recognition, and responsibility

were the most frequent. The results also indicated that the satisfiers and dissatisfiers tended to be mutually exclusive (Herzberg, 1966).

According to Locke (1976), the publication of Herzberg et al.'s study in 1959 signaled the beginning of a new trend in job satisfaction. It was to refocus attention on the work itself, a factor that had been de-emphasized during the human relations movement. The new emphasis suggested that real satisfaction with the job could only be provided by allowing individuals to grow in skill, efficiency, and responsibility made possible by mentally challenging work. The method of improving motivation and performance could be accomplished by the redesign of the work itself.

Research Concerning Job Satisfaction and Motivation of Teachers

In the educational world, Sergiovanni was influenced by Herzberg's (1966, 1968) motivation-hygiene theory. In 1969, he replicated Herzberg's investigation by using almost 100 teachers as subjects. He attempted to determine whether the factors resulting in work satisfaction were connected to the work itself or whether the factors resulting in dissatisfaction were part of the work environment. The subjects were interviewed using the critical incident technique directly adapted from Herzberg. They were asked to relate stories concerning when they felt unusually good about their job and when they felt unusually bad about their job. Also, as part of the technique, they were also asked two clarifying questions: "Can you tell me more precisely why you felt

the way you did?" and "What did these events mean to you?" The results indicated that the satisfiers and dissatisfiers tended to be mutually exclusive and that the factors identified applied to all teachers in the study, irrespective of sex, teaching level, or years of teaching. The most frequently described satisfiers were achievement, recognition, and responsibility. The most frequently described dissatisfiers were interpersonal relations, supervision, and policy and administration (Sergiovanni, 1969).

Other researchers performed investigations similar to those of Herzberg (1966, 1968) and Sergiovanni (1969) and found results that generally supported Herzberg's motivational theory. Jaycox and Tallman (1967) used Herzberg's (1966) critical incident technique to interview several hundred elementary school teachers in the Los Angeles City School District. The teachers were asked, however, to respond in writing instead of in oral statements. Results indicated that achievement, recognition, and interpersonal relations with peers were the greatest motivators. The dissatisfiers were working conditions, policy and administration, and interpersonal relations with peers.

Hanson and Stanley (1969) performed a companion investigation by using nearly 300 high school teachers in the Los Angeles City School District. Their results indicated that achievement, recognition, and the work itself were satisfying. The dissatisfiers were interpersonal relations with students, the work itself, and policy and administration.

Still other research concerning teacher job satisfaction has supported the proposition that teachers were motivated by satisfaction of intrinsic needs. Following

Herzberg's technique, Pederson (1989) interviewed 40 teachers across the grades. His results supported Herzberg's (1966) theory in that he found that the primary motivating factors were achievement and recognition. The primary dissatisfiers were unfairness and school policy/administration. Using a questionnaire that he constructed in an attempt to duplicate Herzberg's (1966) model, Medved (1982) surveyed 70 teachers in a small Midwest suburban school system. Achievement and responsibility were found to be satisfiers, wherever lack of recognition was the main dissatisfier. Caldwell (1992) and Taylor (1986) both used questionnaires to survey nearly 800 elementary school teachers in separate attempts to replicate Herzberg's (1966) work. They both found that achievement contributed to job satisfaction Caldwell (1992) also observed that responsibility and recognition contributed to satisfaction.

In a study of 280 Mississippi teachers in National Exemplary Schools and 383 teachers in other Mississippi schools, Parker (1991) asked teachers to rank a series of ten items in order of motivational influence. The items included achievement, advancement, affiliation, autonomy, creativity, influence, material gain, recognition, safety, and service. He found that the teachers in both groups ranked achievement as the highest motivational factor whereas material gain received the lowest rating.

Nearly 5500 teachers in the Milwaukee Metropolitan Public Schools were given a survey containing ten items related to job satisfaction, advancement, the work itself, recognition, responsibility, salary, commitment, security, achievement, support, and interpersonal relations (Derlin & Schneider, 1994). They were asked to report their

satisfaction concerning each of the items in a four-point Likert-type scale. Approximately one-half of the teachers was from suburban schools, and the remaining one-half was from urban schools. The most satisfying factors of the suburban teachers were recognition and responsibility, whereas the urban teachers were most satisfied by achievement and advancement. When all teacher data were combined, achievement, recognition and responsibility were the most satisfying factors. Salary, advancement and security were the least satisfying.

King, Warren, and Peart's (1988) survey of nearly 6,000 teachers in Ontario resulted in a ranked order listing of the ten most satisfying aspects of teaching and the ten most stressful aspects. Nine of the ten satisfying aspects could be closely correlated with Herzberg's (1966) job satisfaction factors of achievement and the work itself. Also, 9 of the 10 stressful aspects were correlated with Herzberg's hygiene categories of interpersonal relations, working conditions, job security, policy and administration, and supervision.

Almost 1,000 professors from 20 college and university campuses were surveyed by Hill (1987). Data from this investigation also supported Herzberg's (1966) motivational theory. Achievement of students, the work itself, and recognition were identified as the most satisfying aspects of teaching. Salary, policy and administration, and interpersonal relations with peers were found to be the most dissatisfying aspects of teaching.

Additional research by Heller et al. (1992), Frase (1989), and Holdaway (1978) also confirmed that teachers received job satisfaction through intrinsic rewards.

Effective Schools Research and the Role of the Principal

The effective schools research identified characteristics of exemplary schools, several of which could be correlated with Herzberg's (1966) motivational factors. These characteristics included collaborative planning that allowed teachers to become responsible for problem solving and decision making, recognition for teaching successes, expanded numbers of leadership roles, and clear goals (Goodlad, 1984).

Summary

Evidence has lent support to the concept that factors meeting the intrinsic needs of teachers provided job satisfaction. The satisfying factors most commonly mentioned were achievement, recognition, and responsibility. The two most dissatisfying factors were (a) company policy and (b) administration and interpersonal relations, all extrinsic factors. The research presented demonstrated that teachers entered teaching because they were motivated by service and because they received job satisfaction from intrinsic rewards. The lack of intrinsic factors contributed to their desire to leave the profession.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter includes the following five major topics: (a) a description of the survey design, (b) characteristics of the sample, (c) the instruments used in the study, (d) the methods of data collection, and (e) procedures for data analysis.

Design

The design of the proposed study utilized both qualitative and quantitative research strategies to collect data concerning the same occurrence. The qualitative aspect of the study involved replication of the procedure used by Frederick Herzberg (1966), the critical incident technique. Free responses, via a personal telephone interview with each teacher, were elicited to the following statements: (a) Describe an incident when you felt extremely good or happy about your career as a teacher and (b) describe an incident when you felt extremely bad or unhappy about your career as a teacher.

In addition to the qualitative data that were obtained from the teacher interviews, quantitative data were collected from the identical sample of teachers via questionnaires. The questions served to elicit answers related to the 16 factors identified by Herzberg that affected job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Two questionnaires, each using a four-step Likert-type format including alternatives of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree were given immediately

following the telephone interview. One questionnaire referred to the positive incident (see Appendix A) and the other questionnaire referred to the negative incident (see Appendix B). The teachers were to recall the positive incident that they had just described in the interview as they responded to the "positive" questionnaire and to recall the negative incident that they had described as they responded to the "negative" questionnaire.

The principals were given identical questionnaires. They were instructed to answer the questionnaires in the way that they perceived their staffs would answer. The principals were not interviewed.

Selection of Subjects

The district selected for study was the Garden Grove Unified School District (GGUSD), a large suburban district in Orange County, California. The district had an approximate enrollment of more than 40,000 students in 43 elementary schools, nine intermediate schools, and seven high schools.

Four Caucasian teachers were randomly selected from each of the nine intermediate and seven high schools in the GGUSD. Comprising the group of four teachers from each school were one English/language arts teacher, one history/social studies teacher, one mathematics teacher, and one science teacher. The four teachers from each intermediate and high school were exposed to the critical incident technique via the telephone interview and were given the questionnaires (see Appendixes A and B).

The entire population of secondary principals was given the questionnaires only. The 16 principals were asked to respond to the questionnaires as they perceived their teachers would respond (see Appendixes C and D).

Data Collection

Each of the teachers was mailed a one-page letter explaining the background and objectives of the research. The letter also requested their participation in the telephone interview (see Appendix E). Included with the letter was a self-addressed, stamped return postcard (see Appendix F) on which two possible interview times were listed. Upon return receipt of the postcard indicating the choice of interview time, a confirmation letter (see Appendix G) was sent to each teacher. Included with the confirmation letter were the two questionnaires and an ink pen in a sealed envelope, and a self-addressed stamped return envelope.

Each principal was mailed a one-page letter, the two questionnaires, an ink pen, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. The letter explained the background and objectives of the research and requested their participation by completion of the enclosed questionnaires (See Appendix H).

Instrumentation

The qualitative aspect of the study involved replication of the procedure used by Herzberg (1966, 1968), the critical incident technique. The process involved the posing of two highly structured questions requiring the teachers to recall and to

describe actual incidents or events in as much detail as possible. The questions were: (a) Describe an incident when you felt extremely good or happy about your career as a teacher and (b) describe an incident when you felt extremely bad or unhappy about your career as a teacher. Each interview required 15 to 25 minutes to complete and, with the respondent's permission, was recorded on audio-tape.

In addition to the qualitative data collected from teacher interviews, quantitative data were also obtained from the identical sample of teachers. Two questionnaires, each using a four-step Likert-type format with opinions of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree were given immediately following the telephone interview. The teachers were instructed to have the sealed envelope containing the questionnaires available during the interview, but not to open the envelope until instructed to do so.

The questionnaires were adapted, with permission, from an investigation done by Wickstrom (1971). A pilot study of 10 teachers resulted in refinement of the questions.

One questionnaire referred to the positive incident, and the other questionnaire referred to the negative incident. The teachers were to recall the positive incident that they had just described in the interview as they responded to the "positive" questionnaire and to recall the negative incident that they had described as they responded to the "negative" questionnaire.

The principals were given identical questionnaires. They were instructed to answer the questionnaires the way in which they perceived their staffs would answer. The principals were not interviewed.

The questionnaires served to elicit answers related to the 16 factors or categories identified by Herzberg that affected job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. The factors, with 1 to 6 considered motivational and 7 to 16 considered hygiene, (Herzberg, 1966, 1968; Herzberg et al., 1959) were described as follows:

1. Achievement. The definition of achievement also included its opposite, failure, or the absence of achievement. Achievement was described by incidents that involved a specific success such as successfully completing a job, having a good idea or solution to a problem, and seeing the results of one's work.

2. Recognition for achievement. The major criterion for this category was emphasis upon some act of recognition given to the person describing the incident. The recognition, which could have come from a student, parent, supervisor, parent, peer, or almost anyone, involved an act of praise, or criticism.

3. Work itself. This category referred to the actual doing of the job as a source of good or bad feelings about it.

4. Responsibility. Factors relating to responsibility and authority were included in this category; they included incidents when the respondent derived satisfaction from having been given responsibility for his or her own work or the work of others. Also

included were incidents in which there was a loss of satisfaction towards a job resulting from a lack of responsibility.

5. Advancement. This category was concerned with referred to incidents when there was an actual change in the status or position of the person in the company.

6. Possibility of growth. This category included not only the possibility that an individual would be able to move onward and upward within his or her organization, but also a situation in which he was able to advance in his or her own skills and in his or her profession.

7. Supervision-technical. The competence or incompetence, fairness or unfairness of the supervision received were the critical characteristics of this category. Statements about the supervisor's willingness or unwillingness to delegate responsibility or the supervisor's willingness or unwillingness to teach would be in this category, as well as, incidents about a supervisor who was perpetually nagging or criticizing.

8. Company policy and administration. This category described those components of an incident in which some overall aspect of the company was involved. This category involved either the adequacy or inadequacy of organization and management or the harmfulness or beneficial effects of the company's practices, which were generally considered to be personnel practices.

9. Working conditions. This category pertained to the physical conditions for the work, the amount of work, or facilities and equipment for doing the job.

10. Interpersonal relations with peers. Although the factor of interpersonal relations was part of most incidents, this category was defined as involving some actual description about the characteristics of an interaction between the respondent and some other individual: in this study another teacher.

11. Interpersonal relations with subordinates. Although the factor of interpersonal relations was part of most incidents, this category included some actual description about the characteristics of an interaction between the respondent and some other individual, in this study student or students.

12. Interpersonal relations with superiors. Although the category of interpersonal relations was part of most incidents, this category was defined as involving some actual description about the characteristics of an interaction between the respondent and a superior.

13. Status. This category involved incidents when the respondent actually mentioned some sign of status concerning the job.

14. Job security. This category represented the presence or absence of job security.

15. Salary. This category pertained to monetary compensation.

16. Personal life. This category included incidents in which some aspect of the job affected personal life in such a way that the effect was a factor in the feelings of the respondent about his or her job. Family needs for salary and other family problems stemming form the job situation were included.

Data Analysis

All responses to the critical incident interview were coded independently by a two-member team who was familiar with the Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Consensus was reached concerning which of the 16 factors was being exemplified by each response.

The factors being expressed by the interviews were tabulated in terms of frequencies and percentages of total teachers responding. Selected text from the interview illustrated and substantiated the findings. Generally, the excerpts were quoted verbatim. However, any reference or information that could result in the identification of the individual was omitted to ensure total anonymity of the respondents.

Each of the 16 items on each of the two questionnaires referred to one of the 16 factors defined by Herzberg. The mean response for the alternative to each item on each questionnaire was calculated for the total group of teachers and total group of principals as well as for subgroups of individuals as differentiated by relevant variables such as gender and age. In the instance of teachers, further differentiation was made in terms of numbers of years of experience and subject area taught.

Comparisons were achieved between patterns of response of groups and subgroups of respondents for selected items. No inferential statistics were employed. The basis for generalization of the findings does not extend beyond the GGUSD.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the findings for each of the six research questions identified in Chapter I. All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number, and the means have been rounded to the nearest one-hundredth decimal place. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the findings.

To determine the level of acceptance of a motivating factor in the Herzberg (1966, 1969) theory, the following distribution for categorizing the mean scores was predetermined by the researcher prior to the study:
1.00-1.75, a factor that was not accepted; 1.76-2.50, a factor that was slightly accepted; 2.51-3.25, a factor that was moderately accepted; and 3.30-4.00, a factor that was highly accepted. When factors were cited, they were listed in order of acceptance from greatest level of acceptance to least level of acceptance.

Analysis of Findings

Level of Acceptance of Motivating Factors as Perceived by Teachers for Themselves and as Perceived by Administrators as Being Accepted by Teachers (Research Question 1)

Motivating factors concerned with feeling good With reference to the 6 motivating factors that teachers considered to contribute to their feeling good during

the satisfying job incident, Table 1 presents statistical data that demonstrate a high level of acceptance of four of those factors and a moderate degree of acceptance of one factor. The highly accepted factors were, listed in order of level of acceptance, the work itself (mean = 3.91), achievement (mean = 3.88), responsibility (mean = 3.56), and recognition (mean = 3.45) with the possibility of growth (mean = 3.16) being moderately accepted. The remaining factor, advancement (mean = 1.39), was not accepted.

Statistical information concerning the six motivating factors considered by principals to contribute to their teachers' feeling good during a satisfying job incident are set forth in Table 2. The principals gave ratings indicating a perception of a high level of acceptance of three factors, the work itself (mean = 3.94), recognition (mean = 3.94), and achievement (mean = 3.75). The moderately accepted factors were responsibility (mean = 3.25) and the possibility of growth (mean = 3.0). The remaining factor, advancement (mean = 2.19), was slightly accepted.

Motivating factors concerned with feeling bad. Statistical data describing the six motivating factors that teachers considered to contribute to their feeling bad during the dissatisfying job incident are presented in Table 3. Teachers expressed a moderate level of acceptance of one of those factors, the work itself (mean = 3.13). Achievement (mean = 2.45) and recognition (mean = 2.38) were slightly accepted. Advancement (mean = 1.16), possibility of growth (mean = 1.70), and responsibility (mean = 1.55) were not accepted.

Table 1

The Mean Score for Level of Acceptance Indicated by Teachers of Factors Considered Contributing to Their Feeling Good During the Satisfying Job Incident Described During the Critical Incident Interview (N = 64)

Herzberg Factors	Mean	Overall Ranking
Motivators		
Achievement	3.88	2
Advancement	1.39	14
Possibility of Growth	3.16	6
Recognition	3.45	4
Responsibility	3.56	3
Work Itself	3.91	1
Hygiene Factors		
Interpersonal Relations-Peers	1.84	10
Interpersonal Relations-Subordinates	3.33	5
Interpersonal Relations-Superior	1.66	11
Job Security	1.30	15
Personal Life	2.48	7
Policies and Administration	1.55	12
Salary	1.03	16
Status	2.30	8
Supervision	1.69	13
Working Conditions	1.91	9

Note: Score of 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, indicate degree of acceptance of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree.

Table 2

The Mean Score for Level of Acceptance Reflecting Perceptions Held by Principals of Factors Contributing to Teachers' Feeling Good During a Satisfying Job Incident
(N = 16)

Herzberg Factors	Mean	Overall Ranking
Motivators		
Achievement	3.75	2
Advancement	2.19	12
Possibility of Growth	3.00	8
Recognition	3.94	1
Responsibility	3.25	5
Work Itself	3.94	1
Hygiene Factors		
Interpersonal Relations-Peers	2.88	9
Interpersonal Relations-Subordinates	3.69	3
Interpersonal Relations-Superior	3.38	4
Job Security	1.63	13
Personal Life	2.50	10
Policies and Administration	2.19	12
Salary	1.13	13
Status	3.06	7
Supervision	3.13	6
Working Conditions	2.44	11

Note: Score of 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, indicate degree of acceptance of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree.

Table 3

The Mean Score for Level of Acceptance Indicated by Teachers of Factors Considered Contributing to Their Feeling Bad During the Dissatisfying Job Incident Described During the Critical Incident Interview (N = 64)

Herzberg Factors	Mean	Overall Ranking
Motivators		
Achievement	2.45	4
Advancement	1.16	15
Possibility of Growth	1.70	12
Recognition	2.38	6
Responsibility	1.55	13
Work Itself	3.13	1
Hygiene Factors		
Interpersonal Relations-Peers	1.84	10
Interpersonal Relations-Subordinates	2.53	3
Interpersonal Relations-Superior	2.41	5
Job Security	1.34	14
Personal Life	2.25	7
Policies and Administration	2.58	2
Salary	1.00	16
Status	1.78	11
Supervision	2.03	8
Working Conditions	1.89	9

Note: Score of 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, indicate degree of acceptance of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree

Statistical data listed in Table 4 are concerned with the six motivating factors considered by principals to contribute to their teachers feeling bad during a dissatisfying job incident. The principals highly accepted one of those factors, the work itself (mean = 3.31). Achievement (mean = 2.69), recognition (mean = 3.00), and responsibility (mean = 2.56) were moderately accepted. Advancement (mean = 1.88) and possibility of growth (mean = 2.13) were slightly accepted.

Level of Acceptance of Hygiene Factors as Perceived by Teachers for Themselves and as Perceived by Administrators as Being Accepted by Teachers (Research Question 2)

Hygiene factors concerned with feeling good. The statistical data presented in Table 1 concerning the 10 hygiene factors that teachers considered to contribute to their feeling good during the satisfying job incident show that teachers expressed a high level of acceptance of one of the factors, interpersonal relations-subordinates (mean = 3.33). No factors were moderately accepted and four factors were slightly accepted, status (mean = 2.30), personal life (mean = 2.48), working conditions (mean = 1.91), and interpersonal relations with peers (mean = 1.84). The remaining five factors, supervision (mean = 1.69), interpersonal relations with the superior (mean = 1.66), policies and administration (mean = 1.55), job security (mean = 1.30), and salary (mean = 1.03), were not accepted.

Table 4

The Mean Score for Level of Acceptance Reflecting Perceptions Held by Principals of Factors that Contributed to Teachers Feeling Bad During a Dissatisfying Job Incident (N = 16)

Herzberg Factors	Mean	Overall Ranking
Motivators		
Achievement	2.69	7
Advancement	1.88	11
Possibility of Growth	2.13	10
Recognition	3.00	4
Responsibility	2.56	8
Work Itself	3.31	1
Hygiene Factors		
Interpersonal Relations-Peers	2.81	6
Interpersonal Relations-Subordinates	3.13	3
Interpersonal Relations-Superiors	3.25	2
Job Security	1.56	12
Personal Life	2.81	6
Policies and Administration	2.94	5
Salary	1.06	13
Status	2.38	9
Supervision	2.81	6
Working Conditions	2.56	8

Note: Score of 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, indicate degree of acceptance of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree.

The statistical information given in Table 2 referring to the 10 hygiene factors considered by principals to contribute to their teachers feeling good during a satisfying job incident demonstrates that principals highly accepted 2 factors, interpersonal relations-subordinates (mean = 3.69) and interpersonal relations-superior (mean = 3.38). Three factors were moderately accepted, supervision (mean = 3.13), status (mean = 3.06), and interpersonal relations-peers (mean = 2.88). Three factors were slightly accepted, personal life (mean = 2.50), working conditions (mean = 2.44), and policies and administration (mean = 2.19). The remaining 2 factors, job security (mean = 1.63) and salary (mean = 1.13), were not accepted.

Hygiene factors concerned with feeling bad. With respect to the 10 hygiene factors that teachers considered to contribute to their feeling bad during a dissatisfying job incident, the data in Table 3 report that teachers expressed a moderate level of acceptance for two factors, policies and administration (mean = 2.58) and interpersonal reactions-subordinates (mean = 2.53). Teachers slightly accepted six of the factors, interpersonal reactions-superior (mean = 2.41), personal life (mean = 2.25), supervision (mean = 2.03), working conditions (mean = 1.89), interpersonal relations-peers (mean = 1.84), and status (mean = 1.78). Job security (mean = 1.34) and salary (mean = 1.00) were not accepted.

Concerning the 10 hygiene factors considered by principals to contribute to their teachers feeling bad during a dissatisfying job incident, statistical data contained in Table 4 demonstrate that principals highly accepted one factor, interpersonal

relations-superior (mean = 3.25). Principals moderately accepted six of the 10 factors, interpersonal relations-subordinates (mean = 3.13) and policies and administration (mean = 2.94), followed by interpersonal reactions-peers (mean = 2.81), personal life (mean = 2.81) and supervision (mean = 2.81) both equally accepted, and working conditions (mean = 2.56).

Differences in the Responses of the Total Group of Teachers and Total Group of Principals (Research Question 3)

Differences in perceptions of teachers and administrators in six motivating factors associated with feeling good. For the third research question, no mean responses are presented. Having been given previously, they are apparent in relevant tables. With respect to the six motivating factors that were considered by teachers and principals to contribute to teachers feeling good during the positive incident, the levels of acceptance were high by both groups for three of the six factors and moderate for a fourth. Teachers, however, highly accepted responsibility, whereas principals moderately accepted responsibility; and teachers did not accept advancement, whereas principals slightly accepted advancement.

Differences in perceptions of teachers and administrators in six motivating factors associated with feeling bad. For the six motivating factors that were considered by teachers and principals to contribute to a teacher's feeling bad during the negative incident, the teachers moderately accepted one factor that the principals highly

accepted, the teachers slightly accepted two factors that the principals moderately accepted, and the teachers did not accept two factors that the principals slightly accepted. In other words, the level of teacher acceptance concerning five of the six factors was one category of acceptance lower than that of the principals. Additionally, the teachers did not accept the factor, responsibility, that the principals moderately accepted.

Differences in perceptions of teachers and administrators in six motivating factors associated with feeling good. With respect to the levels of acceptance of the 10 hygiene factors that were considered by teachers and principals to contribute to a teacher's feeling good during the positive incident, the levels of acceptance were similar for five of the 10 hygiene factors. More specifically, both groups highly accepted one factor, both slightly accepted two factors, and both did not accept two factors. For three other factors, the level of acceptance by the teachers was a category lower than that for the principals. The teachers slightly accepted two factors while the principals moderately accepted the same two factors, and the teachers did not accept a factor that the principals slightly accepted. However, the teachers accepted neither interpersonal relations-superior nor supervision, whereas the principals highly accepted the former and moderately accepted the latter.

Differences in perceptions of teachers and administrators in six motivating factors associated with feeling bad. With respect to the levels of acceptance of the 10 hygiene factors that were considered by teachers and principals to contribute to

teachers feeling bad during the negative incident, the levels of acceptance were the same for five of the 10 hygiene factors. Specifically, two factors were moderately accepted by both groups, one factor was slightly accepted, and two factors were not accepted. The remaining five factors were slightly accepted by the teachers, while the principals moderately accepted the same five factors.

Differences in Responses of Teachers Differentiated by Selected Demographic Variables (Research Question 4)

The differences between the mean scores for subgroups differentiated by assignment to intermediate school or to high school, age, gender, number of years of professional experience, and subject matter area of teacher were not appreciable. Therefore only responses of the total number of teachers were recorded.

Differences in the Patterns of Perceptions Between Teachers and Principals (Research Question 5)

A discrepancy of 0.75 or greater between the teacher mean level of acceptance and the principal mean level of acceptance was considered a noticeable difference in perception between teachers and principals for that factor. The difference was considered practically significant, not statistically significant. Tests of significance were not done. If the discrepancy was 0.74 or less, the means were considered similar.

With respect to both the positive and negative incidents, the level of acceptance for all factors by the principals, with the exception of three motivating factors involving the positive incident, was higher than the level of acceptance by the teachers.

The statistical data presented in Tables 5 and 6 show that there was a practically significant difference between the mean level of acceptance by the teachers and the mean level of perceived acceptance by the principals for three hygiene factors, interpersonal relations-superior, interpersonal relations-peers, and supervision, for both the satisfying and the dissatisfying incidents. The mean level of acceptance by the principals was greater than that of the teachers for these three factors.

Information on Satisfying and Dissatisfying
Job Experiences Based on Critical Incidents
Reported by Teachers in Interviews
(Research Question 6)

The statistical data in Table 7 describe the information obtained from the critical incidents cited by teachers during interviews directed toward the identification of a satisfying job experience. Of the 64 teachers interviewed, 95.5%, or 61, cited incidents that represented five of the six motivating factors. The three most prominent factors mentioned by 94% of the teachers were, in order of acceptance, recognition (36%), achievement (30%), and the work itself (28%). None of the hygiene factors received more than 3% of the responses.

Table 5

Difference Between the Mean Level Score of Acceptance by Teachers of Factors Considered Contributing to Their Feeling Good During the Positive Incident (Feeling Good) Described During the Critical Incident Interview, and the Mean Level Score of the Principals' Perceptions

Herzberg Factors	Teacher Mean	Principal Mean	Difference
Motivators			
Achievement	3.88	3.75	+0.13
Advancement	1.39	2.18	-0.79*
Possibility of Growth	3.16	3.00	+0.16
Recognition	3.45	3.94	-0.49
Responsibility	3.56	3.25	+0.31
Work Itself	3.91	3.94	-0.03
Hygiene Factors			
Interpersonal Relations-Peers	1.84	2.88	-1.04*
Interpersonal Relations-Subordinates	3.33	3.69	-0.36
Interpersonal Relations-Superior	1.66	3.38	-1.72*
Job Security	1.30	1.63	-0.33
Personal Life	2.48	2.50	-0.02
Policies and Administration	1.55	2.19	-0.64
Salary	1.03	1.13	-0.10
Status	2.30	3.06	-0.76*
Supervision	1.69	3.13	-1.44*
Working Conditions	1.91	2.44	-0.53

* Practically significant (not statistically significant)

52

Table 6

Difference Between the Mean Level Score of Acceptance by Teachers of Factors Considered Contributing to Their Feeling Bad During the Negative Incident (Feeling Bad) Described During the Critical Incident Interview, and the Mean Level Score of the Principals' Perceptions

Herzberg Factors	Teacher Mean	Principal Mean	Difference
Motivators			
Achievement	2.45	2.69	-0.24
Advancement	1.16	1.88	-0.72
Possibility of Growth	1.70	2.13	-0.43
Recognition	2.38	3.00	-0.62
Responsibility	1.55	2.56	-1.01*
Work Itself	3.13	3.31	-0.18
Hygiene Factors			
Interpersonal Relations-Peers	1.84	2.81	-0.97*
Interpersonal Relations-Subordinates	2.53	3.13	-0.60
Interpersonal Relations-Superior	2.41	3.25	-0.84*
Job Security	1.34	1.56	-0.22
Personal Life	2.25	2.81	-0.56
Policies and Administration	2.58	2.94	-0.34
Salary	1.00	1.06	-0.06
Status	1.78	2.38	-0.60
Supervision	2.03	2.81	-0.78*
Working Conditions	1.89	2.56	-0.67

* Practically significant (not statistically significant)

53

Table 7

Frequency and Percentages of Factors Represented by the Description of the Satisfying Job Incident During the Critical Incident Interview (N = 64)

Herzberg Factors	Frequency of of Responses	Percentage of Responses	Overall Ranking
Motivators			
Achievement	19.0	30.0	2
Advancement			
Possibility of Growth	1.0	1.5	5
Recognition	23.0	36.0	1
Responsibility			
Work Itself	18.0	28.0	3
Hygiene Factors			
Interpersonal Relations-Peers	1.0	1.5	5
Interpersonal Relations-Subordinates	2.0	3.0	4
Interpersonal Relations-Superior			
Job Security			
Personal Life			
Policies and Administration			
Salary			
Status			
Supervision			
Working Conditions			

Note: Most of the percentages were expressed as integral values.

In comparison, the statistical information presented in Table 8 obtained from the critical incidents cited by teachers from interviews directed toward the identification of a dissatisfying job experience, showed that 17.2%, or 11 teachers, cited incidents that represented two of the six motivating factors. The two factors were recognition (7.8%) and achievement (7.8%).

In order to illustrate recognition, achievement, and the work itself, excerpts from the critical incident interviews was selected for inclusion in the text of this chapter. Essentially, the excerpts have been quoted verbatim. However, any specific references or information which could result in identification of the individual have been omitted to ensure total anonymity of the respondents.

Recognition was the most frequently cited satisfying factor during the interviews. Recognition by students was most often given. The following two excerpts are illustrative of recognition:

> On the first day of school there was a letter in my mail box from a former student. I had the student in seventh and eighth grade English. It had been a number of years; in fact it was several years since he graduated from high school. He said that he just wanted me to know that I still think about you often and always remember that you taught me the beauty of words. I keep this letter in my safe with several other letters from students.

> A former student visited my room to give me a pair of gold earrings. I told her that I could not accept the gift. However, the student insisted because she told me that I had helped her reach her potential; and that she had wanted to touch my heart as I had touched hers.

Table 8

Frequency and Percentages of Factors Represented by the Description of the Dissatisfying Job Incident During the Critical Incident Interview (N = 64)

Herzberg Factors	Frequency of Responses	Percentage of Responses	Overall Ranking
Motivators			
Achievement	5.0	7.8	5
Advancement			
Possibility of Growth			
Recognition	5.0	7.8	5
Responsibility			
Work Itself			
Hygiene Factors			
Interpersonal Relations-Peers	6.0	9.4	4
Interpersonal Relations-Subordinates	17.0	26.6	1
Interpersonal Relations-Superior	9.0	14.0	3
Job Security			
Personal Life			
Policies and Administration	10.0	15.6	2
Salary			
Status			
Supervision	6.0	9.4	4
Working Conditions	6.0	9.4	4

Note: Most of the percentages were expressed as integral values.

The following example depicts recognition that was cited as a dissatisfying factor:

> We were discussing a social factor in my history class. The next thing I know is that I have a parent calling because something that was said had been misinterpreted by the outside. As a result, I felt criticized.

Achievement was generally associated with the successful completion of a lesson or topic. The examples below illustrate achievement:

> It was really difficult to know if you were really doing a good job or not. You have no means of comparison. But when I got the AP exam score results and I saw that almost all of my students passed the exam, I felt like I successfully achieved teaching the subject. I felt like I did a good job.

> I tried an idea from my master teacher. Each student read four books and, at the end of the quarter, we had a sharing day of the results. The students did such a good job and they were very happy with the results and I felt a genuine sense of accomplishment. I was really pleased that my lesson went so well and felt a sense of accomplishment that it did.

The examples cited that reflected achievement as a dissatisfying factor generally involved unsuccessfully reaching the students as the following excerpt illustrates:

> Recently, I taught a chapter to my sheltered history students. I thought that I and they had done a good job. However, when I got the test scores back, they were very low. Obviously, I was doing something wrong and I was not getting the messages across.

The work itself was the third most frequently cited satisfying factor which is reflected in the following excerpts:

> I had been working for a considerable length of time with a student concerning multiplication. When this student finally realized that 6 X 8 was the same as 8 X 6, I saw the light go on for the student and I could see the joy in his eyes. It was wonderful to be part of this understanding and joy that the student was experiencing.

> I was teaching a pretty heavy topic in my history class when I was overwhelmed by what the kids could do with such a heavy topic. I was so impressed with how they related to such a difficult concept and made connections, that I had to sit down on the floor. During that class, that day, I felt such a communion of positive vibes.

With respect to the hygiene factors, as compared with 4.5%, or three teachers, stating incidents representing two of the 10 hygiene factors during interviews directed at the identification of a satisfying job experience, 84.4%, or 54 teachers, cited incidents that represented six of the 10 hygiene factors during interviews directed at the identification of a dissatisfying job experience. Reported in Table 8, those six factors, listed in order of level of acceptance were, interpersonal relations-subordinates (26.6%), policies and administration (15.6%), interpersonal relations-superior (14.0%), interpersonal relations-peers (9.4%), supervision (9.4%), and working conditions (9.4%).

In order to illustrate dissatisfying experiences associated with interpersonal relations-subordinates, policies and administration, interpersonal relations-superior, interpersonal relations-peers, supervision, and working conditions, excerpts from the critical incident interviews were chosen for inclusion. The following two passages depict the dissatisfying factor, interpersonal relations-subordinates

> This past year, I had this uncomfortable class. In all the years I have taught, this class was the worst. There were several students in that class that were rude and disrespectful. They would say things that really hurt me as a person and as a teacher. There were days when I would go home and feel terrible.
>
> I know that I am a new teacher and that I have a lot to learn about discipline. But I have this class that is rude and disrespectful. It's like they forget that you

are human. On some days, it is hard for me to keep my feelings from showing when they say things that hurt.

The factor, policies and administration, the second most frequently cited dissatisfying factor, is exemplified as follows:

It was my second year of teaching, which was a long time ago, when someone came into my classroom and told me that I was being involuntarily transferred into the sub pool. I was doing a good job and enjoyed where I was. My feelings were really hurt. I checked out the policies and they did have the right to do this. They had the right to do what they wanted with you, even though you had a contract. Even after all these years and the fact that I am happy where I am now, I feel bad about this incident.

I had requested a door between my room and the room next door so that I could supervise and help other teachers when they would bring their students into the room. Instead, they put in windows because, I was told, that was the policy. It made no sense because windows did not allow me to be accessible to the room, but apparently that did not matter.

The following two excerpts are illustrative of interpersonal relations-superior

I started this year with the best schedule that I have ever had. Since then there have been two schedule changes. I can understand the need for schedule changes, but it is the way I was informed that made be angry. The principal came into my class while I was teaching at the front of the room and told me about the most recent change. The principal was impersonal and did not give any rationale. Since I was in front of the class, teaching, I could not respond. I felt really stuck. The incident made me feel not valued. As a result of this incident, I actually considered changing schools.

It was during my early years of teaching. The principal had made an appointment for me to talk to him. I had heard rumors that I was being excessed from the school because the school was down-sizing, you could say. So, I was waiting outside the principal's door and he knew that I was there. However, the principal was yakking away with two other teachers. I sat outside for about 45 minutes while they were chewing the fat. When they finally left, the principal came out and said that he didn't have time to talk to me today, we'd have to make it another time. I felt ignored and not treated with respect. I felt that it was very unprofessional to treat me the way that I was.

The following excerpts depict the dissatisfying factor, interpersonal relations-peers:

> One particular teacher at school does not believe that teaching reading is in his particular job description. We have had many conversations about the importance of reading, but nothing will change this person's mind.

> I had a miscommunication with a colleague. Another teacher sent students to my room to look for some supplies. The students came in and just started looking through my cabinets. I asked them what they were doing and they said that their teacher sent them to look for pattern blocks. I told them to tell the teacher to see me either before or after school to get the supplies, but not during class. The teacher got very upset with me and was very rude to me for several days after that.

Mentioned equally dissatisfying as the hygiene factor, interpersonal relations-peers, was the factor, supervision. Supervision is described by the following examples

> When I came to intermediate school from elementary school, I was given no support with the grading procedures, attendance, etc. etc. I felt like I was inconveniencing the administration when I asked questions. I really needed a mentor, or someone to show me the ropes during that first year. I asked, but got no help.

> The most dissatisfying experience dealt with the teacher evaluation experience. I felt that the vice-principal was taking a very slanted, very ignorant approach to what I was doing in the classroom. He was very negative and antagonistic. He came in with a demeaning, holier than thou attitude and had no suggestions whatsoever.

Also mentioned equally dissatisfying as factors, interpersonal relations-peers and supervision, was the hygiene factor, working conditions The following two excerpts are illustrative of working conditions:

> For the first two years of my teaching career, I was a traveling teacher. Each period, I went to a different room. It was really difficult, especially when I had to cart lab equipment and supplies with me. I felt disjointed and, from comments

that I heard from other teachers, appeared disjointed and scattered. I was very stressed and considered quitting teaching.

This year I have been very frustrated trying to teach sheltered history because I do not have the proper books and materials.

Discussion

In previous studies, researchers utilized various methods to gather data concerning teacher job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Pederson (1989) and Sergiovanni (1969) orally interviewed teachers by using the critical incident technique utilized by Herzberg which Hanson and Stanley (1969) and Jaycox and Tallman (1967) modified by converting it to a written format. Caldwell (1992), Medved (1982), and Taylor (1986) developed questionnaires in their attempt to replicate Herzberg et al.'s (1959) work. Wickstrom (1971) developed a written questionnaire similar to that used by Friedlander (1964) with non-teachers. Wickstrom (1971) then combined the questionnaire and the written critical incident technique to retrieve data from teachers in his study. Yet, other researchers (Derlin & Schneider, 1994; King, et al., 1988; Parker, 1991) utilized various other written methods of gathering job satisfaction data such as ranking lists of items in order of importance or indicating the amount of importance specific items were to their job satisfaction. This current study was unique in that the researcher gathered data by using two methods, the oral critical incident interview technique and the written questionnaire.

With respect to the first research question concerning the level of acceptance of the six motivating factors in the Herzberg motivation-hygiene theory, the teacher

findings related to the satisfying job experience were not surprising, but the findings pertaining to the dissatisfying job experience were slightly different from what had been expected. With the exception of advancement, the results were related to the satisfying job experience indicated that teachers perceived motivating factors of the work itself, achievement, responsibility, and the possibility of growth as contributing to their feeling good during the satisfying job incident. It was understandable that advancement was not accepted at a high level because teachers, in view of the structure of the public educational system, have very little opportunity for job advancement. These results were consistent with the research findings of Hanson and Stanley (1969), Jaycox and Tallman (1967), Sergiovanni (1969), and Wickstrom (1971), who had also found these motivating factors, in varying orders of acceptance, were associated with teacher feelings of being satisfied about their job.

The findings for teachers concerning their level of acceptance of the six motivation factors with respect to the dissatisfying job incident showed a moderate level of acceptance for the work itself, but only a slight level of acceptance of achievement and recognition. Even though the acceptance of the work itself was inconsistent with the Herzberg (1966) model, this finding was consistent with the research of Hanson and Stanley (1969) and Sergiovanni (1969).

In summary, the findings of this study were generally consistent with the conceptualizations in the Herzberg's model in that all the motivators combined contributed more to job satisfaction than they did to job dissatisfaction.

Relative to the second research question concerning the level of acceptance of the 10 hygiene factors in the Herzberg motivation-hygiene theory (1966), the teacher findings related to the satisfying job incident, again, were not surprising. Interpersonal relations-subordinates was at a level of high acceptance. Considering the nature of the teaching task, interpersonal relations with subordinates, or students, one might interpret as being central to the job itself, rather than related to the job context as Herzberg (1966) considered it for engineers and accountants. Because students are the very crux of a teacher's work, they should account for many of the good and bad feelings that teachers have. If interpersonal relations-subordinates were considered integral to the work itself, then this factor would be categorized as a motivator in the educational setting instead of a hygiene factor. The results in this study concerning interpersonal relations-subordinates were consistent with those of Hanson and Stanley (1969), Jaycox and Tallman (1967), and Wickstrom (1971). Four other hygiene factors were only slightly accepted.

The findings for teachers concerning the level of acceptance of the 10 hygiene factors with respect to the dissatisfying job incident were lower than had been expected, with only two factors, policies and administration and relations-subordinates, receiving a moderate level of acceptance and with five factors receiving only a level of slight acceptance.

In summary, the findings were generally consistent with what would be anticipated from Herzberg's model in that all the hygiene factors combined contributed more to job dissatisfaction than they did to job satisfaction.

The principals' perceptions were fairly consistent with which motivating factors would be accepted by teachers to contribute to their feeling good during the satisfying incident or bad during the dissatisfying incident.

In comparison, the principals' perceptions were different from those of teachers concerning which hygiene factors led teachers to feel good during the satisfying incident and bad during the dissatisfying incident. There was a practically significant difference between how the principals perceived that interpersonal relations-superior, supervision, and interpersonal relations-peers would affect teachers' feelings. The principals perceived that these three factors had a more positive effect upon teachers' feelings during the positive incident than the teachers actually indicated. The most impressive difference was that the principals perceived that the teachers would accept at a high level interpersonal relations-superior, whereas the teachers rejected this factor. In other words, the principals very incorrectly perceived that they contributed to helping teachers feel good during the satisfying incident.

Furthermore, there was a practically significant difference between how the principals perceived that these same three hygiene factors would affect the teachers during the dissatisfying incident and what the teachers perceived their level of acceptance to be. The differences between the perceptions held by principals regarding the level of

teacher acceptance and the actual level of acceptance by teachers, however, were not so great for the dissatisfying incident as they were for the satisfying incident. In summary, these findings indicated that the perceptions held by the principals of how they related to their teachers, as well as how the teachers related to each other, needed a reality check.

To continue, the results of Herzberg's (1966) study showed that during the satisfying critical incidents the motivating factors dominated over the hygiene factors by a ratio of 4:1 and that during the dissatisfying critical incidents, the hygiene factors dominated over the motivators by a ratio of 2:1 (Herzberg, 1966). In summary, for the acceptance level of factors perceived by teachers as indicated in responses to questionnaire items concerning the satisfying incident, four motivation factors were greatly accepted and one factor was moderately accepted as compared to one hygiene factor being greatly accepted and four hygiene factors being slightly accepted. These results were well within Herzberg's (1966) motivation to hygiene factor ratio of 4:1.

Additionally, the level of acceptance of factors perceived by teachers as indicated by responses to the questionnaires concerning the dissatisfying incident revealed that one motivating factor was moderately accepted and two were slightly accepted, whereas two hygiene factors were moderately accepted and six were slightly accepted. These results demonstrated that the hygiene factors dominated over the motivating factors during the dissatisfying incident in a ratio of 2:1, an outcome consistent with Herzberg's findings.

The findings of the critical incident interviews were strongly correlated with what comes to be predicted from Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Motivating factors

appeared in 98% of the satisfying incidents described by teachers. The top three factors, recognition, achievement, and the work itself, were identical to those found by Herzberg (1966) and Sergiovanni (1969). This study, however, revealed that recognition was the most frequently expressed factor with achievement ranking second. Herzberg and Sergiovanni observed the reverse. Achievement was the most often observed with recognition ranking second in importance. During the coding process, achievement and recognition were two factors difficult to separate, as teachers were receiving recognition for some form of teaching achievement. However, when the story focused on the actual thanking of the teacher, often with a gift or with some form of written documentation, for their services or a job well done, the incident was categorized as recognition.

Furthermore, the results from the satisfying incident interviews supported the questionnaire results. The mean scores for the level of acceptance of achievement and of the work itself were identical and greatest with respect to factors contributing to a teacher's feeling good during the satisfying job experience, with the recognition mean ranking third.

The satisfying job incident questionnaire results did, however, indicate a high level of acceptance of the factor, interpersonal relations-subordinates. Even though no interviews resulted in this factor being expressed, most of the incidents described did involve the teacher's working relationships with students. It seemed highly probable that, when some teachers responded to the questionnaires immediately following the interview, they marked, great degree, as a response to the question, "The working

relationships with my students affected my feelings during the incident." This response would explain the high mean level of acceptance of that factor on the questionnaires. In other words, to some teachers, the factors, the work itself and interpersonal relations-subordinates, were virtually synonymous.

In summary, the results from both the questionnaires and the critical incident interviews very strongly supported the finding that motivating factors were associated with a teacher's feeling good during satisfying job incidents.

The results from the dissatisfying incident interviews showed one major difference from the corresponding questionnaire results. More than one-fourth of those interviewed cited the factor, interpersonal relations-subordinates. These incidents generally involved some sort of student behavioral or disciplinary problem that occurred during the act of teaching. None of the interviews indicated the factor, the work itself. In comparison, however, for responses on the questionnaire, the work itself was accepted at a moderate level by teachers as a factor that helped them to feel bad during the dissatisfying incident. It seems probable that, when the teachers responded to the questionnaire immediately following the interview, they marked, great degree, as a response to the item stating, "The incident took away from the joy and satisfaction derived from the act of teaching," because the dissatisfying incidents took place during the act of teaching. In other words, the teachers associated their bad feelings contributed by the factor, interpersonal relations-subordinates, with the factor, the work itself. As a result, on the questionnaire, they gave a response indicating that they moderately

accepted both constructs as factors that made them feel bad during the dissatisfying incident, when, in reality, the interpersonal relations-subordinates, not the work, made them feel bad. Again, some teachers considered that the work itself and interpersonal relations-subordinates were essentially synonymous.

As to results of Hanson and Stanley (1969), Sergiovanni (1969), and those of this study, they all showed that the work itself, involving interactions with students, was a frequently described dissatisfying factor. Findings from Hanson and Stanley, Wickstrom (1971), and this study showed that interpersonal relations-subordinates was highly accepted as a motivating factor during the satisfying incident. It is suggested that the hygiene factor, interpersonal relations-subordinates, as defined by Herzberg (1966), did not directly apply to the educational setting. The implication of these findings is that caution should be used in assuming that research results from business and industrial settings may be strictly applied to the educational setting.

To continue, policies and administration was the second most described factor during the dissatisfying critical incident interviews. This result supports the questionnaire results in that policies and administration was moderately accepted as a dissatisfying factor as well as the factor receiving the second highest level of acceptance as a dissatisfying factor. The critical incident interview results concerning the factors, achievement, recognition, interpersonal relations-peers, interpersonal relations-superior supervision and working conditions, also supported the results obtained from responses to the questionnaires.

In summary, the outcomes from both the questionnaires and the critical incident interviews strongly supported the finding that hygiene factors were likely to contribute to a teacher's feeling bad during dissatisfying job incidents.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This chapter sets forth the purpose of the study, research questions, methodology including instrumentation and data analysis, major findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future study.

Purpose

Within the conceptual framework of Herzberg (Herzberg, 1966, 1968; Herzberg et al., 1959), the two major purposes of this dissertation were to (a) determine factors associated with the perceptions of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction held by both male and female Caucasian teachers in grades 7-12 and (b) compare the perceptions of teachers about those factors to the perceptions indicated by principals as contributing to teacher job satisfaction and teacher job dissatisfaction.

Research Questions

The six research questions designed to accomplish the purposes previously stated (the first five corresponding to the questionnaire information and the sixth one corresponding to the interview data) were as follows:

1. For the six motivating factors in the Herzberg motivation-hygiene theory (achievement, advancement, possibility of growth, recognition for achievement, responsibility, work itself), what was the level of acceptance expressed by teachers for themselves and the level of acceptance by teachers as indicated by administrators on

each of several item statements in a four-step Likert-type format that were perceived as contributing to teachers' (a) feeling good or (b) feeling bad about the job of teaching at the levels of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree (by the total sample of teachers and the total sample of principals)?

2. For the 10 hygiene factors in the Herzberg motivation-hygiene theory (interpersonal relations with peers, interpersonal relations with subordinates, interpersonal relations with superiors, job security, personal life, policy and administration, salary, status, supervision, working conditions), what was the level of acceptance expressed by teachers by themselves and the level of acceptance by teachers as indicated by administrators on each of several item statements in a four-step Likert-type format that were perceived as contributing to teachers' (a) feeling good or (b) feeling bad about the job of teaching at the levels of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree (by the total sample of teachers and the total sample of principals)?

3. What differences, if any, occurred in the responses to item statements of the total group of administrators and total group of teachers with respect to the six motivating factors enumerated in the first research question and the 10 hygiene factors cited in the second research question in the same context of being perceived as contributing to good or bad feelings?

4. With respect to the first two research questions, what differences were noted among subgroups of teachers differentiated by (a) assignment to intermediate school or

to high school, (b) age, (c) gender, (d) number of years of professional experience, (e) subject matter area of teacher?

5. To the extent possible, what differences, if any, in the patterns of perceptions were noted between teachers and principals?

6. In terms of information obtained from critical incidents cited by teachers from interviews directed toward identification of a satisfying job experience and a dissatisfying job experience, what similarities or differences could be identified from the total sample of teachers?

Methodology

Population and sample. The sample of 64 teachers represented four teachers from each of the nine intermediate and seven high schools in the Garden Grove Unified School District (GGUSD). Comprising the sample of 64 teachers, 16 were from each of four subject matter areas of English/language arts, history/social studies, mathematics, and science. Of the population of 16 intermediate and high school principals in the GGUSD, all 16 participated in the study. The GGUSD has an ethnically diverse student population representing various socioeconomic levels.

Instrumentation: Qualitative data The study utilized both qualitative and quantitative research strategies to collect data concerning the same occurrence. The qualitative aspect of the study involved a personal telephone interview with each teacher during which answers to the following statements were elicited: (a) Describe an incident when you felt extremely good or happy about your career as a teacher and

(b) describe an incident when you felt extremely bad or unhappy about your career as a teacher.

Instrumentation: Quantitative data. Quantitative data were collected from the identical sample of teachers via questionnaires that served to elicit answers related to the 16 factors identified by Herzberg (1966, 1968) that affected job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Two questionnaires, each using a four-step Likert-type format with alternatives of not at all, slight degree, moderate degree, or great degree, were given immediately following the telephone interview. One questionnaire referred to the positive incident and the other questionnaire referred to the negative incident. The teachers were to recall the positive incident that they had just described in the interview as they responded to the "positive" questionnaire and to recall the negative incident that they had described as they responded to the "negative" questionnaire.

The principals were given identical questionnaires. They were instructed to answer the questionnaires the way that they perceived their staffs would answer. The principals were not interviewed.

Selected Findings

Within the framework of the research questions, the following selected findings were noted:

1. Teachers accepted the motivation factors, work itself, achievement, responsibility, recognition, and possibility of growth, in that order, as factors that contributed to their feeling good during a satisfying job experience.

2. Principals perceived that teachers would accept the motivation factors, work itself, recognition, achievement, responsibility, and possibility of growth, in that order, as factors that would contribute to their feeling good during a satisfying job incident.

3. Teachers accepted the motivation factor, work itself, as a factor that contributed to their feeling bad during the dissatisfying job incident.

4. Principals perceived that teachers would accept the motivation factors, work itself, achievement, recognition, and responsibility, in that order, as factors that would contribute to their feeling bad during a dissatisfying job incident.

5. Teachers accepted the hygiene factor, interpersonal relations-subordinates, as a factor that contributed to their feeling good during the satisfying job incident.

6. Principals perceived that teachers would accept the hygiene factors, interpersonal relations-subordinates, interpersonal relations-superior, supervision, status, and interpersonal relations-peers, in that order, as factors that would contribute to their feeling good during the satisfying incident.

7. Teachers accepted the hygiene factors, policies and administration and interpersonal relations-subordinates, in that order, as factors that contributed to their feeling bad during the dissatisfying incident.

8. Principals perceived that teachers would accept the hygiene factors, interpersonal relations-superior, interpersonal relations-subordinates, policies and administration, interpersonal relations-peers, personal life, supervision, and working

conditions, in that order, as factors that contributed to their feeling bad during a dissatisfying job incident.

9. Subgroups of teachers, differentiated by assignment to intermediate school or to high school, age, gender, number of years of professional experience, or subject matter area, tended not to differ in their responses to sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

10. There was a practically significant difference between the mean level of acceptance by the teachers and the mean level of acceptance by teachers as perceived by principals for three hygiene factors, interpersonal relations-superior, interpersonal relations-peers, and supervision for both the satisfying and dissatisfying job experiences. The mean level of perceived acceptance by the principals was greater than the mean level of acceptance by the teachers.

11. During the satisfying critical incident interviews, 95.5%, or 61 teachers, cited incidents that represented 5 of the 6 motivating factors. The three most frequently expressed factors were, listed in order of frequency, recognition, achievement, and the work itself.

12. During the dissatisfying critical incident interviews, 84.4%, or 54 teachers, cited incidents that represented six of the 10 hygiene factors. Those factors were, in order of frequency, interpersonal relations-subordinates, policies and administration, interpersonal relations-superior, interpersonal relations-peers, supervision, and working conditions.

Conclusions

On the basis of the statistical findings for the sample of intermediate and high school teachers and the population of intermediate and high school principals studied, the following conclusions became evident:

1. Teachers derived the most job satisfaction from the intrinsic factors of recognition, achievement, and the work itself.

2. It was evident that intrinsic factors contributed more to the job satisfaction of teachers than they did to job dissatisfaction.

3. Teachers derived the most job dissatisfaction from the two extrinsic factors: (a) policies and administration and (b) interpersonal relations-subordinates.

4. It was apparent that extrinsic factors contributed more to job dissatisfaction of teachers than they did to job satisfaction.

5. Principals accurately perceived that the intrinsic factors of recognition, achievement, and the work itself contributed to their teachers' feelings of job satisfaction.

6. Principals inaccurately perceived the effects of the factors of interpersonal relations-superior, interpersonal relations-peers, and supervision upon both the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of their teachers. The principals especially misperceived that their behavior had a positive effect upon teachers' job satisfaction.

7. The findings were consistent with those of other research studies involving teachers and factors of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

8. The findings supported Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory in that motivators contributed to job satisfaction and hygiene factors contributed to job dissatisfaction.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered:

1. As recognition, achievement, and the work itself provided job satisfaction for teachers, in order to motivate teachers, principals need to reward their teachers for successes. The rewards could be in the form of personal notes, certificates of achievement, acknowledgment in the school newspaper, or any number of other methods of honor and praise.

2. Direct application of Herzberg's method does not transfer from the business and industrial settings to the educational setting. The factor interpersonal relations-subordinates in the business setting does not have the same meaning that it does in the educational setting. The subordinates in the educational setting are an integral part of the work itself. If the study were replicated, interpersonal relations-subordinates should be divided into two categories: the extrinsic factor, interpersonal relations with students involving discipline, and the intrinsic factor, interpersonal relations with students not involving discipline.

3. In order to motivate their staffs more effectively, principals need to become more aware of the factors that satisfy and dissatisfy their specific staffs.

4. Schools need to seek ways to improve the understanding of teachers concerning their role in preparing students for the work force. This effort will help teachers understand the importance of their role in that student preparation.

REFERENCES

Andrew, M. D. (1983). The characteristics of students in a five-year teacher education program. Journal of Teacher Education, 34, 20-23.

Beffert, D. L. (1992). A comparison of teacher and administrator perception of job satisfaction for teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming.

Berelson, B. & Steiner, G. (1964). Human behavior. New York: Hartcourt, Brace and World.

Caldwell, C. L. (1992). Teachers' perceptions of motivating behaviors of elementary principals: An empirical test of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tulsa, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 354A.

Campbell, J. P., & Pritchard, R. D. (1976). Motivational theory in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 63-130). Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century (Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession). New York: Carnegie.

Charters, W. W. Jr. (1970). Some factors affecting teacher survival rates in school districts. American Educational Research Journal, 7(1), 1-27.

Coon, D. (1980). Introduction to psychology. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

DeLong, T. J. (1987). Teachers and their careers: Why do they choose teaching? Journal of Career Development, 14, 118-125.

Derlin, R., & Schneider, G. (1994). Understanding job satisfaction: Principals and teachers. Urban Education, 29, 63-88.

Educational Testing Service. (1948-1996). Scholastic Aptitude Test. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Drake, T. & Roe, W. (1986). The principalship. New York: Macmillan.

Elam, S. M. (1989). The second Gallup poll of teachers' attitude toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 79, 785-798.

Frase, L. E. (1989). Effects of teacher rewards on recognition and job enrichment. Journal of Educational Research, 83, 52-57.

Friedlander, F. (1964). Job characteristics as satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 48, 388-392.

Fullen, M. G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change New York: Teachers College Press.

Gallup, A. (1984). The Gallup poll of teachers' attitude toward the public school. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 23-38.

Gellerman, S. W. (1968). Management by motivation. New York: American Management Association.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill.

Hall, B. W., Pearson, L. C., & Carroll, D. (1992). Teachers' long-range teaching plans: A discriminant analysis. Journal of Educational Research, 85, 221-225.

Hansen, O., & Stanley, G. M. (1969). A study of the motivation of high school teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California

Hart, A. W. (1992, April). Work feature values of tomorrow's teachers: Work redesign as an incentive and school improvement policy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Hart, A. W., & Murphy, M. J. (1990). New teachers react to redesigned teacher work. American Journal of Eduction, 98, 224-250.

Heller, H. W., Clay, R. J., & Perkins, C. M. (1992). Factors related to teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. ERS Spectrum, 10, 20-24.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). Management of organizational behavior Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World Publishing

Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? Harvard Business Review, 46, 53-54.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: Wiley.

Heussler, T.B. (1993). Affirmation and ambivalence about teaching: A study of outstanding Vermont teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Vermont and State Agriculture College, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 3063A.

Hill, M. (1987). A theoretical analysis of faculty job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Educational Research Quarterly, 10, 36-44.

Holdaway, E. A. (1978). Facet and overall satisfaction of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14, 30-47.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Jantzen, J. M. (1981). Why college students choose to teach: A longitudinal study. Journal of Teacher Education, 32, 45-48.

Jaycox, W., & Tallman, L. (1967). A study of the motivation of elementary school teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Joseph, P. B. and Green, N. (1986). Perspectives on reasons for becoming teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 37, 29-33.

King, A. J., Warren, W., & Peart, M. (1988). The teaching experience. Toronto Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation.

Kirby, S. and Grissmer, D. (1993, June). Policies affecting learning outcomes through impacts on teachers. Paper presented at the Seminar of the World Bank/Harvard Institute for International Development, Cambridge, MA.

Lawler, E. (1973). Motivation in work organizations. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Likert, R. (1977). The human organization. New York: McGraw Hill.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mark, J. H. and Anderson, B. D. (1978). Teacher survival rates--A current look. American Educational Research Journal, 13(3), 379-383

Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper and Rox

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill

Medved, J. A. (1982). The applicability of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene Theory. Educational Leadership, 39, 555.

Metropolitan Life. (1985). The Metropolitan Life survey of the American teacher. New York: Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

Murnane, R. J., Singer, J. D., Willett, J. B., Kemple, J. J., & Olsen, R. J. (1991). Who will teach? Policies that matter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Murray, E. J. (1964). Motivation and emotion. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1994). The condition of education-1994. (NCES-94-149). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1993). America's teachers: Profile of a profession. (NCES-93-025). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

National Education Association. (1980). Teacher opinion poll: Job satisfaction. Today's Education, 4, 8.

Parker, R., & Partridge, R. (1991, November). Expectancy, teacher motivation and exemplary schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington, KY.

Pederson, L. R. (1989). Teachers' perceptions of factors which affect job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Syracuse, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 3227A.

Pessima, J. L. (1993). Attrition from teaching in the public schools in the state of Pennsylvania (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 5, 3071A.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1969). Factors that affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. In F. D. Carver and T. J. Sergiovanni (Eds.), Organization and human behavior (pp. 249-260). New York: McGraw Hill.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1979). Supervision: Human perspectives. New York: McGraw Hill.

Sweeny, J. (1981). Professional discretion and teacher satisfaction. The High School Journal, 65, 1-6.

Taylor, G. A. III. (1986). A study of job satisfaction as perceived by the certificated staff in Florida public elementary schools. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 1185A.

Wickstrom, R. A. (1971). An investigation into job satisfaction among teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon.

Willcox, I. & Beigel, H. (1953). Motivations in the choice of teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 4, 106-109.

Zimbardo, P. G. (1979). Psychology and life. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Zimpher, N. (1989). The RATE Project: A profile of teacher education students. Journal of Teacher Education, 40, 27-30.

APPENDIX A

POSITIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Positive Questionnaire for Teachers

DIRECTIONS:

Please refer to the interview and the positive incident you just described that made you feel good about your job as a teacher. There are 16 factors that may have caused you to feel good about your job in that particular incident.

Using the 1-4 rating scale below, rate each factor as to how much it caused you to feel good. Circle your response. If the factor had nothing to do with your feeling good, circle the number 1.

RATING SCALE:

not at all	slight degree	moderate degree	great degree
1	2	3	4

1. The physical environment (e.g., good working conditions, supplies and equipment) influenced my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

2. The incident had a direct positive affect upon my home/family life and relations. (1) (2) (3) (4)

3. As a result of the incident, I felt that someone gave me recognition for doing good work. (1) (2) (3) (4)

4. The interpersonal relations with my superior (e.g., principal, vice-principal) affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

5. The polices or administrative rules of the school or system affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

6. The incident reinforced my feelings that my job gave me a great deal of responsibility and autonomy for determining how I would teach my own lessons. (1) (2) (3) (4)

7. The incident facilitated my career advancement. (1) (2) (3) (4)

8. The incident positively affected how others viewed my position as a teacher. (1) (2) (3) (4)

9. The incident increased my job security/tenure. (1) (2) (3) (4)

10. The incident reinforced the joy and satisfaction that I receive from the act of teaching. (1) (2) (3) (4)

11. The working relationships with my students affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

12. The interpersonal relationships with my co-workers affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

13. The fact that I was working under a superior who was very competent, effective and/or fair influenced my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

14. As a result of the incident, I felt a genuine sense of achievement as a teacher. (1) (2) (3) (4)

15. I was expecting a salary increase as a result of the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

16. I felt that the incident facilitated my professional/personal growth. (1) (2) (3) (4)

APPENDIX B

NEGATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Negative Questionnaire for Teachers

DIRECTIONS:

Please refer to the interview and the negative incident you just described that made you feel unhappy or bad about your job as a teacher. There are 16 factors that may have caused you to feel bad about your job in that particular incident.

Using the 1-4 rating scale below, rate each factor as to how much it caused you to feel bad. Circle your response. If the factor had nothing to do with your feeling bad, circle the number 1.

RATING SCALE:

1	2	3	4
not at all	slight degree	moderate degree	great degree

1. The physical environment (e.g., poor working conditions, supplies and/or equipment) influenced my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

2. The incident had a direct negative affect upon my home/family life and relations. (1) (2) (3) (4)

3. As a result of the incident, I felt that I was being criticized for my work. (1) (2) (3) (4)

4. The interpersonal relations with my superior (e.g., principal, vice-principal) affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

5. The polices or administrative rules of the school or system affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

6. The incident reinforced feelings that my job gave me little responsibility and autonomy for determining how I would teach my own lessons. (1) (2) (3) (4)

7. The incident negatively affected my career advancement. (1) (2) (3) (4)

8. The incident negatively affected how others viewed my position as a teacher. (1) (2) (3) (4)

9. The incident decreased my job security/tenure. (1) (2) (3) (4)

10. The incident took away from the joy and satisfaction derived from the act of teaching. (1) (2) (3) (4)

11. The working relationships with my students affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

12. The interpersonal relationships with my co-workers affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

13. The fact that I was working under a superior who was very incompetent, ineffective and/or unfair influenced my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

14. As a result of the incident, I felt little sense of achievement as a teacher. (1) (2) (3) (4)

15. The incident negatively affected a salary increase. (1) (2) (3) (4)

16. I felt that the incident hindered my professional/personal growth. (1) (2) (3) (4)

APPENDIX C

POSITIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

Positive Questionnaire for Principals

DIRECTIONS:

Please think if a positive incident in your teaching career that made you feel good about your job as a teacher. There are 16 factors that may have caused you to feel good about your job in that positive incident.

Using the 1-4 rating scale below, rate each factor as to how much it caused you to feel good. Circle your response. If the factor had nothing to do with your feeling good, circle the number 1.

RATING SCALE:

not at all	slight degree	moderate degree	great degree
1	2	3	4

1. The physical environment (e.g., good working conditions, supplies and equipment) influenced my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

2. The incident had a direct positive affect upon my home/family life and relations. (1) (2) (3) (4)

3. As a result of the incident, I felt that someone gave me recognition for doing good work. (1) (2) (3) (4)

4. The interpersonal relations with my superior (e.g., principal, vice-principal) affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

5. The polices or administrative rules of the school or system affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

6. The incident reinforced my feelings that my job gave me a great deal of responsibility and autonomy for determining how I would teach my own lessons. (1) (2) (3) (4)

7. The incident facilitated my career advancement. (1) (2) (3) (4)

8. The incident positively affected how others viewed my position as a teacher. (1) (2) (3) (4)

9. The incident increased my job security/tenure. (1) (2) (3) (4)

10. The incident reinforced the joy and satisfaction that I receive from the act of teaching. (1) (2) (3) (4)

11. The working relationships with my students affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

12. The interpersonal relationships with my co-workers affected my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

13. The fact that I was working under a superior who was very competent, effective and/or fair influenced my feelings during the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

14. As a result of the incident, I felt a genuine sense of achievement as a teacher. (1) (2) (3) (4)

15. I was expecting a salary increase as a result of the incident. (1) (2) (3) (4)

16. I felt that the incident facilitated my professional/personal growth. (1) (2) (3) (4)

APPENDIX D

NEGATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

Negative Questionnaire for Principals

DIRECTIONS:

Please think of a negative incident in your teaching career that made you feel unhappy or bad about your job as a teacher. There are 16 factors that may have caused you to feel bad about your job in that negative incident.

Using the 1-4 rating scale below, rate each factor as to how much it caused you to feel bad. Circle your response. If the factor had nothing to do with your feeling bad, circle the number 1.

RATING SCALE:

1	2	3	4
not at all	slight degree	moderate degree	great degree

1. The physical environment (e.g., poor working conditions, supplies and/or equipment) influenced my feelings during the incident.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
2. The incident had a direct negative affect upon my home/family life and relations.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
3. As a result of the incident, I felt that I was being criticized for my work.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
4. The interpersonal relations with my superior (e.g., principal, vice-principal) affected my feelings during the incident.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
5. The polices or administrative rules of the school or system affected my feelings during the incident.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
6. The incident reinforced feelings that my job gave me little responsibility and autonomy for determining how I would teach my own lessons.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
7. The incident negatively affected my career advancement.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
8. The incident negatively affected how others viewed my position as a teacher.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
9. The incident decreased my job security/tenure.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
10. The incident took away from the joy and satisfaction derived from the act of teaching.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
11. The working relationships with my students affected my feelings during the incident.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
12. The interpersonal relationships with my co-workers affected my feelings during the incident.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
13. The fact that I was working under a superior who was very incompetent, ineffective and/or unfair influenced my feelings during the incident.	(1) (2) (3) (4)
14. As a result of the incident, I felt little sense of achievement as a teacher.	(1) (2) (3) (4)

15. The incident negatively affected a salary increase. (1) (2) (3) (4)

16. I felt that the incident hindered my professional/personal growth. (1) (2) (3) (4)